

EXAMINATION OF SECONDARY SCHOOL (5TH -8TH GRADES) PHYSICAL TRAINING AND SPORTS TEACHING PROGRAM ACCORDING TO TAXONOMIES

Dr. M. Enes IŞIKGÖZ
Physical Training and Sports Academy
Mardin Artuklu University, Türkiye
pdgenes@gmail.com

Dr. Kerim Karabacak
Hasan Ali Yücel Educational Faculty
İstanbul University, Cerrahpaşa
kerimk@istanbul.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine the learning outcomes of physical training and sports teaching programs (5th - 8th grades) which have been revised in 2018 according to cognitive, affective and psychomotor taxonomies. Document analysis method had been used in the study. The document of this study is established from physical training and sports teaching programs (5th -8th grades) which have been revised in 2018. 61 (%50) of 122 learning outcomes which have been given in the teaching program are related with cognitive field, 29 (%23,77) of them are related with affective field and 32 (%26,23) of them are related with psychomotor field. Mostly cognitive field learning outcomes are existent in 5th and 6th grades, affective ones in 8th grades and psychomotor field exist in 7th grades. Whereas factual knowledge does not take place in all class levels in knowledge dimension of the program, it has been observed that the learning outcomes mostly have been in conceptual knowledge dimension and in the frame of cognitive process they have been concentrated on in application process. It has been determined that the learning outcomes related to affective field mostly concentrate on 8th grades and sub-level of giving value, the learning outcomes related to psychomotor field mostly concentrate on 5th, 6th, and 7th grades and grades and sub-level of transforming to a skill.

KEY WORDS: Secondary school physical training and sports teaching programs, cognitive, affective, learning outcome, psychomotor.

INTRODUCTION

Elements taking place in the educational system take an important place in the realization of education policies of the countries. One of the elements of these is educational programs' having a dynamic structure. Educational program is all activities of an educational institution related to realization of aims of national education and institutions which have been provided for children, young people and adults. Teaching program is defined as gaining knowledge and skills in the direction of educational program aims and realizing this in a planned method, it is also concentrated on skills and applications at schools and is established from knowledge categories. (Varış, 1988). Teaching programs taking place in the content of educational programs is a guide demonstrating what, why and how the subjects will take place in teaching –learning process in a course, in other words it is a project plan having this qualification (Özçelik, 1992). The countries are able to determine the knowledge, skill and abilities which they target for their citizens they should gain with the help of educational programs which have been prepared in the content of national educational systems and they try to realize these in the direction of some objectives determined previously with the help of these programs (Önal and Topçu, 2013). As teaching programs have been an instrument for guiding the course, time and techniques of the required skills which should be gained, they have an important place for qualified education (Bayburtlu, 2015). Because teaching programs demonstrating a product by reflecting the features of the age being lived are also instruments for educating human type having qualifications which this age requires in this society at the same time (Doğanay, 2005).

An educational program has four basic elements as (1) objectives, (2) content, (3) educational situations and (4) evaluation. Objectives state the features required for individuals at the end of learning-teaching process. Content is thought as complete subjects relevant to the objectives in the educational program. In other words, it is a list of subjects to be studied in reaching the objectives. Educational situations state which learning-teaching models, strategies, methods and techniques and instruments will be used to reach the objectives. Evaluation is to determine at what level the objectives have been reached (Demirel, 2015).

Objective in education is the required features such as decided knowledge, skill, interest, attitude, motivation (Sönmez, 2007). In other words, these are required features which should an adult have and they should be gained by education. According to Demirel(2007) these features can be knowledge, abilities, skills, attitudes, interests, habits and similar of these. Objectives are the most important element of educational program, the reason of this is educational program is the determiner of other elements (Arslan, 2018). Because the answer of question “why” includes “objective” element in all these occupations. As teaching has been an action which has been thought on deeply, it has a special importance (Anderson and Krathwohl, 2010). Objectives are being arranged at vertical and

horizontal dimension, the objectives at vertical dimension are determined as far, general and special objectives (Ertürk, 1998). Far objectives are defined as political objectives (Sönmez, 2011) in the light of educational philosophy of a country, special objectives as objectives of a course and units and subjects in this course (Özdemir, 2007). Special objectives are determined as separated to three fields as cognitive, affective and psychomotor in horizontal dimension (Demirel, 2015).

Classification of objectives as cognitive, affective and psychomotor and sequencing the objectives from basic to complex, easy to difficult, concrete to abstract as each other's condition has been accepted as taxonomy in literature (Sönmez, 2007). These taxonomies are still being used extensively in our age. The study of classification of objectives as gradually (taxonomy) started in USA in 1948, three taxonomies in three fields as cognitive, affective and psychomotor have been developed. In this content, Bloom and his colleagues (1956) developed the first taxonomy related to "cognitive field classification" and it had been translated in many languages in the world and known as Bloom Taxonomy in literature (Demirel, 2015). Taxonomies related to "affective field" which had been established by Bloom (1956) and revised by Krathwohl and his colleagues (1964) and "psychomotor field" by Simpson (1966) followed these. Although different taxonomies have been developed related to the classification of objectives gradually, the most accepted and used ones had been these taxonomies (Senemoğlu, 2010).

Taxonomy related to cognitive field classification of Bloom and his colleagues (1956) has been related with mental processes, it is established from 6 levels from basic to complex and concrete to abstract as knowledge, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation, except evaluation other levels are separated into sub levels in each other. Every level in taxonomy is accepted as pre-condition of the next level and in order to gain the behavior in the next level the behaviors in previous levels should be gained (Ari, 2011). In the direction of the critics made this taxonomy in this process which is used with the name Bloom taxonomy, taxonomy had been revised and developed again in 2001 (Anderson and colle. 2001) and it is used recently revised Bloom taxonomy (Krathwohl, 2002).

Revised Bloom taxonomy has two dimensions as (1) knowledge and (2) cognitive process. Knowledge dimension is established from (A) factual knowledge, (B) Conceptual knowledge, (C) procedural knowledge and (D) metacognitive knowledge. Cognitive process dimension includes (1) remembering, (2) understanding, (3) application, (4) analysis, (5) evaluation and (6) creation. New Bloom taxonomy is established from six levels as the old one, but three levels (knowledge, understanding, analysis) has been named again, the place of upper two levels changed and the names of the levels have been transformed to action form. All original sub categories have been changed as verbal noun and named as cognitive processes (Bümen, 2006; Ari, 2013). In this content, important innovations have been made in taxonomy classification and demonstrating the levels more understandable and detailed has been provided (Yüksel, 2007).

Affective field taxonomy developed by Krathwohl and colleagues. (1964) is established from five levels as (1) perception (2) giving reaction, (3) giving value (4) organization and (5) making as individualism. This field includes attitudes, beliefs and orientations shaping and giving direction to human behaviors. Affective field is a field where the individual's interest, attitude, motivation, love and fright have been dominant (Demirel, 2015). Affective field learning outcomes taking place in educational programs demonstrate how the students feel at learning-teaching process and how their objective levels change in the context of feelings (Duman ve Yakar, 2017).

Psychomotor field taxonomy developed by Simpson (1966) is established from seven levels as (1) perception (2) foundation, (3) guided action (making with a guide, making at supervision of a guide), (4) being mechanic (5) realizing as a skill, (6) orientation (7) creation. Levels of psychomotor field are related with the capacities of the muscles requiring durability, power, elasticity, agility or not demonstrating a concrete skill (Senemoğlu, 2010). The individual demonstrate some skills by using some or all body parts, muscles of him as psychomotor. As cognitive and affective processes are the subject of psychomotor behavior, this field is one with another with cognitive and affective processes (Sönmez, 2011).

When the literature has been examined, it is seen that studies are existent in which taxonomic analyses have been made related to different teaching programs (Yolcu, 2019; Aktan, 2019; İlhan and Gülersoy, 2019; Büyükalan and Baysal, 2019; Çelik and colleagues., 2018; Aslan and Atik, 2018; Efe and Efe, 2018; Eke, 2018; Avşar and Mete, 2018; Ünsal and Korkmaz, 2017; Akarsu, 2017; Zorluoğlu and colleagues., 2016; Tahaoğlu, 2014; Zorluoğlu and colleagues, 2013; Karabacak, 2013). Most of these studies intensify on Bloom taxonomy. The studies in which physical training and sports course teaching program learning outcomes in the context of different taxonomies (Uğraş and Aral, 2018; Güllü and colleagues (2011a) have been examined are limited. In these studies, Uğraş and Aral (2018) examined physical training and sports course teaching program learning outcomes according to revised

Bloom taxonomy Güllü and colleagues examined (2011) physical training and sports course teaching program learning outcomes according to cognitive, affective and psychomotor field. Again studies of Güllü and colleagues in which they examined applied elementary physical training and sports course teaching program (1st-8th grades) starting from 2006-2007 semester is existent. In this study, it is aimed to examine secondary school physical training and sports course teaching program learning outcomes which started to be applied in 2018-2019 semester in the frame of different taxonomies(cognitive, affective and psychomotor).

METHOD

Document analysis method from qualitative research methods has been used in this study which examines secondary school (5th-8th grades) physical training and sports course teaching program learning outcomes in the frame of different taxonomies. Document analysis, which has been known as examination process according to the facts at the center of written material, record or documents, is used database of generally course books and teaching program in educational studies (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2008). "Secondary school (5th-8th grades) physical training and sports course teaching program" which has been applied since 2018-2019 semester with Ministry of National Education's (MoNE) 19.01.2018 dated and 6 numbered board decision Board of Education has been used as a document in this research. (MoNE, 2018). Learning outcomes distribution related to learning and sub-learning fields relevant to the classroom level have been presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of learning outcomes of physical training and sports course teaching program relevant to the grades and fields

Learning field-sub Learning field	5. Grade	6. Grade	7. Grade	8. Grade	Total
1. Action Competence					
1.1. Action skills	7	8	8	5	28
1.2. Action concepts, principles end related life skills	9	9	10	12	40
1.3. Action strategy and tactics	2	2	1	1	6
2. Active and healthy life					
2.1. Regular physical activity	1	1	2	2	6
2.2. Physical activity concepts, principles and related life skills	7	6	5	6	24
2.3. Cultural values	5	5	4	4	18
Total	31	31	30	30	122

122 learning outcomes presented in physical training and sports course teaching program(5th-8th grades) have been examined by using "Bloom Cognitive Taxonomy" revised by Anderson and his colleagues (2001), "Affective Field Taxonomy" developed by Krathwohl and his colleagues. (1964) and "Psychomotor Field Taxonomy" developed by Simpson (1966). Learning outcomes have been transferred to Excel program, and they have been coded in relevant taxonomic levels according to learning and sub learning places in teaching program and the meaning they included. Ideas of an expert on educational programs and teaching an academician and two physical training and sports course teachers have been benefited at coding level to increase the reliability of the research. In this content some changes have been made in coding and a consensus has been established. The data taken from the research has been transformed to tables and number of learning outcomes related to every taxonomic field and sub levels and their numbers were given with percentage values and numbers.

FINDINGS

Table 2. Distribution of learning outcomes of physical training and sports course teaching program relevant to cognitive, affective and psychomotor fields at classroom level

Grade	Learning outcome number	Cognitive field		Affective field		Psychomotor field	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
5 th Grade	31	16	51,61	6	19,35	9	29,03
6 th Grade	31	16	51,61	6	19,35	9	29,03
7 th Grade	30	14	46,67	7	23,33	9	30,00
8 th Grade	30	15	50,00	10	33,33	5	16,67
Total	122	61	50,00	29	23,77	32	26,23

According to Table 2, 122 total learning outcomes have been given in physical training and sports course teaching program ; 61 (%50) of them have been related with cognitive, 29 (%23,77) of them have been related with affective and 32 (%26,23) of them have been related with psychomotor field. At classroom level, cognitive field learning outcomes have been %51,61 at 5th and 6th grades, %46,67 at 7th grades , %50,00 at 8th grades , affective field learning outcomes have been %19,35 at 5th and 6th grades , %23,33 at 7th grade %33,33 at 8th grade, psychomotor field learning outcomes have been %29,03 at 5th and 6th grades, %30 at 7th grades and %16,67 at 8th grades. Most

cognitive field learning outcomes have been in 5th and 6th grades, affective ones at 8th grade and psychomotor ones at 7th grade in the program.

Table 3. Distribution of learning outcomes of secondary school physical training and sports course teaching program relevant to cognitive field according to revised Bloom taxonomy

Grade	Knowledge dimension	Cognitive Process Dimension						Total	
		Remembering	Understanding	Application	Analyzing	Evaluation	Creation	n	%
5 th grade	Factual knowledge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Conceptual knowledge	3	5	1	-	-	-	9	56,25
	Procedural knowledge	-	1	1	-	-	-	2	12,50
	Metacognitive knowledge	-	2	-	-	3	-	5	35,71
	Total	3	8	2	-	3	-	16	26,23
6 th grade	Factual knowledge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Conceptual knowledge	1	3	3	-	-	-	7	43,75
	Procedural knowledge	-	-	2	-	1	1	4	25,00
	Metacognitive knowledge	1	1	-	-	1	2	5	31,25
	Total	2	4	5	-	2	3	16	26,23
7 th grade	Factual knowledge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Conceptual knowledge	1	-	5	-	-	-	6	42,86
	Procedural knowledge	-	-	2	-	3	-	5	35,71
	Metacognitive knowledge	-	-	1	-	-	2	3	21,43
	Total	1	-	8	-	3	2	14	22,95
8 th grade	Factual knowledge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Conceptual knowledge	2	5	1	-	-	1	9	60,00
	Procedural knowledge	1	-	2	1	-	-	4	26,67
	Metacognitive knowledge	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	13,33
	Total	3	5	3	1	2	1	15	24,59
General Total		9 (%14,75)	17 (%27,87)	18 (%29,51)	1 (%1,64)	10 (%16,39)	6 (%9,84)	61	100,00

When Table 3 is examined, it is observed that learning outcomes mostly intensify on conceptual knowledge dimension in knowledge dimension of physical training and sports course teaching program (5th grade: %56,25, 6th grade: %43,75, 7th grade: %42,86, 8th grade: %60). It is seen that the ratings at procedural knowledge dimension have been %12,50 at 5th grade, %25,00 6th grade, %35,71 7th grade, %26,67 8th grade, the ratings at metacognitive knowledge dimension have been %35,71 5th grade, %31,25 6th grade, %21,43 7th grade, %13,33 8th grade. Learning outcomes related to conceptual knowledge takes place mostly in 8th grade, least at 7th grade, learning outcomes related to procedural knowledge takes place mostly in 7th grade, least at 5th grade, learning outcomes

related to metacognitive knowledge takes place mostly in 5th grade, least at 8th grade. It has been observed that factual knowledge at all classroom levels in the program does not take place.

Again when Table 3 is examined, it is observed that learning outcomes mostly intensify on application (n:18; %29,51) in the frame of cognitive process in knowledge dimension of physical training and sports course teaching program according to revised Bloom taxonomy, understanding (n:17; %27,87), evaluation (n:10; %16,39), remembering (n:9; %14,75), creating (n:6; %9,84) and analyzing (n:1; 1,64) processes follow this. At classroom level, it has been determined that cognitive processes related to understanding in 5th grades (n:8) and 8th grades (n:5) have been concentrated on, cognitive processes related to application in 6th grade (n:5) and 7th grade (n:8) have been concentrated on. It is observed that all cognitive processes take place in 8th grade, in 5th grade analyzing and creating, in 6th grade analyzing take place and in 7th grade understanding and analyzing cognitive processes do not take place.

Table 4. Distribution of learning outcomes of secondary school physical training and sports course teaching program relevant to affective field sub-levels

Grade	Affective field					Total
	Perception	Giving reaction	Giving value	Organization	Making as individualism	
5. Grade	1	4	1	-	-	6 %20,69
6. Grade	-	2	4	-	-	6 %20,69
7. Grade	-	1	4	2	-	7 %24,14
8. Grade	-	-	5	3	2	10 %34,48
Total	1 (%3,45)	7 (%24,14)	14 (%48,28)	5 (%17,24)	2 (%6,90)	29 %100,00

According to Table 4, 29 of learning outcomes of secondary school physical training and sports course teaching program are related with affective field. 6 (%20,69) of affective field learning outcomes take place in 5th and 6th grade, 7(%24,14) in 7th grade and 10 (%34,48) in 8th grade. The most learning outcome in affective field is in 8th grade. When learning outcome numbers at sublevels of affective field have been examined, it is seen that the most learning outcome has been in giving value sub level (%48,28) then giving reaction (%24,14), organization(%17,24), making individualism (%6,90) and perception (%3,45) take place. It is observed that “organization” and “making individualism” takes place in 5th grade, “perception”, “organization” and “making individualism” takes place in 6th grade, “perception” and “making individualism” takes place in 7th grade, in 8th grade “perception” and “giving reaction” affective field sublevel learning outcomes do not take place.

Table 5. Distribution of learning outcomes of secondary school physical training and sports course teaching program relevant to psychomotor field sub-levels

Grade	Psychomotor field							Total
	Perception	Foundation	Guided action	Being mechanic	Making as a skill	Orientation	Creation	
5 th Grade	-	-	6	1	2	-	-	9 %28,13
6 th Grade	-	-	-	7	2	-	-	9 %28,13
7 th Grade	-	-	-	-	6	1	2	9 %28,13
8 th Grade	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	5 %15,63
Total	-	-	7 (%21,88)	9 (%28,13)	11 (%34,38)	2 (%6,25)	3 (%9,38)	32 %100,0

When Table 5 is examined, it is seen that 32 of learning outcomes of secondary school physical training and sports course teaching program are related with psychomotor field. %28,13 of psychomotor field learning outcomes take place in 5th grade, %28,13 in 6th grade and %28,13 in 7th grade, %15,63 in 8th grade. It has been determined that the most learning outcome in psychomotor field sub-levels has been in “making as a skill (%34,38)”, “being mechanic (%28,13)”, “guided action (%21,88)”, “creating(%9,38)” and orientation (%6,25)” psychomotor field sub-levels follow this. At all classroom levels of program, “perception” and “foundation” takes place in 5th grade, “orientation” and “creating” takes place in 6th grade, “guided action”, “orientation” and “creating” takes place in 7th grade, “guided action” and “being mechanic” learning outcomes sub levels have not been seen.

DISCUSSION AND RESULT

In the study in which learning outcomes of secondary school (5th-8th grades) physical training and sports course teaching program have been examined according to cognitive, affective and psychomotor field taxonomies, it has been seen that learning outcomes related to cognitive field have been the most. 122 total learning outcomes have been given in physical training and sports course teaching program; 61 of them have been related with cognitive, 29 of them have been related with affective and 32 of them have been related with psychomotor field. It has been determined that 33 learning outcomes in cognitive field, 66 in affective field, 15 in psychomotor field take place in secondary school physical training and sports course teaching program in the study in which Güllü and colleagues (2011b) examined physical training and sports course teaching program since 2006-2007 semester in the context of learning outcomes, activity samples and measurement-evaluation methods. At this point, when staging of secondary and elementary schools again, revising teaching programs according to the conditions of the day and dynamic process of the program have been taken into account, it is seen that there are important changes in the content of number of learning outcomes of the program.

Uğraş and Aral (2018) determined that 48 of total 122 learning outcome in the program have been cognitive, 37 psychomotor and 37 affective, most of the learning outcomes have been in cognitive field in their study in which they examined cognitive learning outcomes taking place in physical training and sports course teaching program according to the revised Bloom taxonomy in 2017. Mostly cognitive learning outcomes have been in teaching program in our study, the finding of the study corresponds in this direction, but number of learning outcomes determined in cognitive, affective and psychomotor fields do not correspond each other. In our study, “Secondary school physical training and sports course teaching program” being applied in 2018-2019 semester and accepted in 2018 have been examined, Uğraş and Aral (2018) examined “Secondary school physical training and sports course teaching program” which has been started to be applied since 2017-2018 semester. In this content, it is thought that there have been some differences because of combining some learning outcomes under more than field and some changes in program learning outcomes.

Learning outcomes in teaching program in cognitive field mostly have been in 5th and 6th grades, affective field in 8th grade and psychomotor field learning outcomes in 7th grade. Learning outcomes in “knowledge dimension” of the program has been intensified on “conceptual knowledge”, it has been seen that “factual knowledge” did not take place. “Conceptual knowledge” learning outcomes mostly take place in 8th grade least in 7th grade, learning outcomes related to “procedural knowledge” mostly take place in 7th grade least in 5th grade, “metacognitive knowledge” learning outcomes mostly take place in 5th grade least in 8th grade. Again according to revised Bloom taxonomy, at “knowledge dimension” of secondary school physical training and sports course teaching program, it has been seen that most learning outcomes in the frame of “cognitive process” have been at “application” process, then comes “understanding”, “evaluation”, “creating”, and “analyzing” processes. It has been observed that whereas all cognitive processes take place in 8th grade, “analyzing” and “creating” in 5th grade, “understanding” and “analyzing” cognitive processes do not take place in 7th grade.

When studies of Uğraş and Aral (2018) have been examined, it has been determined that learning outcomes of cognitive field have been mostly in 5th, 6th and 7th grades, least in 8th grade, learning outcomes at knowledge dimension mostly intensify on “procedure knowledge” at all classroom levels, “fact knowledge” takes place in a limited percentage. In the same study, it has been seen that most learning outcomes at “cognitive process” have been in “understanding” and then “application”, “analysis”, “evaluation”, “formation” and “remembering”. These findings partly support our study. Because of examined programs’ being revised and becoming valid on different dates, some possible changes in program learning outcomes and being able to write some learning outcomes under more than one field, it is thought that there are some changes in the findings. In the research in Güllü and colleagues (2011a) evaluated the learning outcomes of physical training and sports course teaching program of upper secondary school (9th-12th grades) which has been started to be applied in 2010-2011 semester, it is demonstrated that the program intensify on affective field. When it is taken into account that learning outcomes of affective field have been mostly in 8th grade in our study, it is thought that a program on affective field should be requested in transition to upper secondary school.

Total 29 of teaching program learning outcomes are related with affective field. Most of the learning outcomes related to affective field are in 8th grade. When learning outcome numbers in sub levels of affective field have been examined, it has been seen that most learning outcome has been on “giving value”, the least one has been on “giving reaction”. It has been observed that “organization” and “making as individualism” take place in 5th grade, “perception”, “organization” and “making as individualism” take place in 6th grade, “perception”, and “making as individualism” take place in 7th grade, “giving reaction”, and “perception” do not take place in 8th grade. In Uğraş and Aral’s (2018) study it has been seen that number of learning outcomes of affective and psychomotor fields have been equal, cognitive field is the most. This finding taken in the frame of affective field learning

outcomes support our study finding in the frame of whole program. Güllü and colleagues (2011b) in which they examined elementary and secondary education physical training and sports course teaching program being applied since 2006-2007 semester, they have determined that most objective behavior have been written at secondary school in affective field learning outcomes has been “giving value”, the least has been “perception” dimension. It is seen that numerical knowledge protects its place at these levels.

It has been seen that 32 learning outcomes take place in psychomotor field in teaching program, most of these learning outcomes have been in 5th, 6th and 7th grades, according to sub-levels of psychomotor field the most learning outcome has been on “making as a skill”, the least has been on “orientation”. At all classroom levels “perception” and “foundation” sub-levels have been seen, “orientation” and “creating” at 5th level, “making with a guide”, “orientation” and “creating” at 6th level, “making with a guide”, “being mechanic” at 7th level, other sub-levels have not been seen. Güllü and colleagues (2011b) in their study have determined that the most objective behavior in psychomotor field learning outcomes at secondary school has been “making as a skill” the least one has been “creating”, “making with a guide” and “orientation” did not take place as objective behaviors. When our study findings have been taken into account, similar results like numerical knowledge take place at sub-levels of psychomotor level.

Educational program is a dynamic process formed of objective, content, educational situations and evaluation. In the light of feedback as a result of application and evaluation of programs, some changes are being realized in the direction of nowadays. Changes have been completed in 2015-2016 semester in teaching programs starting from 2005 by MoNE in this content in our country. Since 2016-2017 semester, changes in teaching programs gained a different dimension, revision and change studies are still being made in a detailed way in the programs. In this study, secondary school teaching program learning outcomes which started in 2018-2019 semester by revising lastly in 2018 have been examined in the direction of expert ideas in the context of taxonomies and the data taken has been tried to be presented as quantitative. In addition to quantitative researches related to learning outcomes of the programs, qualitative researches can be made and their functionality can be discussed. Similar research results can be achieved and reached new results by examining with meta-analysis method.

KAYNAKÇA

- Akarsu, S. (2017). İlköğretim (1-8) müzik öğretimi programı kazanımlarının bilişsel, duyuşsal ve devinişsel açıdan incelenmesi. *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 5(44), 279-289.
- Aktan, O. (2019). İlkokul matematik öğretim programı dersi kazanımlarının yenilenen Bloom Taksonomisine göre incelenmesi. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, doi: 10.9779/pauefd.523545, 1-18.
- Anderson, L.W. and Krathwohl, D.R. (Eds.) (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom’s taxonomy of educational objectives. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Arı, A. (2011). Bloom’ un gözden geçirilmiş bilişsel alan taksonomisinin Türkiye’de ve uluslararası alanda kabul görme durumu. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 11, 749-772.
- Arı, A. (2013). Bilişsel alan sınıflamasında yenilenmiş Bloom, SOLO, Fink, Dettmer Taksonimleri ve uluslararası alanda tanınma durumları. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 6(2), 259-263.
- Arslan, A. (2018). Öğretim hedefleri. Öğretim ilke ve yöntemleri. (Edt: Ali Arslan, Cevat Eker), Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Bümen, N. T. (2006). Program Geliştirmede Bir Dönüm Noktası: Yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*. 31(142), 3-14.
- Efe, H. ve Efe, R. (2018). 9. sınıf biyoloji dersi öğretim programındaki kazanımların yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisi’ ne göre karşılaştırılması: 2013, 2017 ve 2018 yılları. *International Journal of New Trends in Arts, Sports & Science Education*, 7(3), 1-10.
- Aslan, M. ve Atik, U. (2018). 2015 ve 2017 İlkokul Türkçe dersi öğretim programı kazanımlarının revize edilmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim (TEKE) Dergisi*, 7(1), 528-547.
- Avşar, G. ve Mete, F. (2018). Türkçe öğretim programlarında kullanılan fiillerin yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre sınıflandırılması. *Karaelmas Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1), 75-87.
- Bayburtlu, Y.S. (2015). 2015 Türkçe dersi öğretim programı ve 2006 Türkçe dersi öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi. *Turkish Studies-International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish and Turkic*, 10(15), 137-158.
- Bloom, B.S., Englehart, M.D, Furst, E.J, Hill, W.H and Krathwohl, D.R. (1956). *Taxsonomy of educational objectives. Book I: Cognitive Domain*. U.S.: Longman.
- Büyükalın, F.S. ve Baysal, S.B. (2019). Analysis of social studies curriculum objectives according to revised Bloom taxonomy. *Inonu University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 20(1), 234-253.

- Çelik, S., Kul, Ü. ve Uzun, S.Ç. (2018). Ortaokul matematik dersi öğretim programındaki kazanımların yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(2), 775-795.
- Demirel, Ö. (2007). *Eğitimde program geliştirme* (10. Baskı). Ankara: PEGEM Yayınları.
- Demirel, Ö. (2015). *Eğitimde program geliştirme: Kuramdan uygulamaya* (22. Baskı). Ankara: PEGEM Yayınları.
- Doğanay, A. (2005). Öğretimde kavram ve genellemelerin geliştirilmesi. Hayat Bilgisi ve Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretimi. (Edt: Öztürk, C. ve Dilek, D.), Ankara: PEGEM-A Yayıncılık.
- Duman, B. ve Yakar, A. (2017). Öğretime yönelik duyuşsal farkındalık ölçeği. *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education*, 6(1), 200-229.
- Eke, C. (2018). Ortaöğretim fizik dersi öğretim programındaki kazanımların yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre analizi. *Sosyal Araştırmalar ve Davranış Bilimleri*, 4(6), 69-84.
- Ertürk, S. (1988). *Eğitimde program geliştirme*. Ankara: Meteksan A.Ş.
- Güllü, M., Arslan, C., Uğraş, S. ve Görgüt, İ. (2011a). Yeni ortaöğretim beden eğitimi ders programı kazanımlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, Özel Sayısı, 122-133.
- Güllü, M., Arslan, C., Görgüt, İ. ve Uğraş, S. (2011b). İlköğretim beden eğitimi dersi (1-8. sınıflar) öğretim programı ve kılavuzunun incelenmesi. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8(özel sayı), 122-133.
- İlhan, A. ve Gülersoy, A.E. (2019). Evaluation of the achievements of 10th grade geography course curriculum according to the revised bloom taxonomy. *International Journal of Geography and Geography Education*, 39, 10-28.
- Karabacak, K. (2013). Matematik Problemi Çözme Basamaklarının Gösteri Araçları İle öğretiminin Öğrenci Başarısına Etkisi. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 2(1), 323-341.
- Krathwohl, D.R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(4), 212-218.
- Krathwohl, D.R. Bloom, B.S. and Masia, B.B. (1964). Taxonomy of educational objectives. The classification of educational goals. Handbook II: Affective domain. New York: David McKay Company Inc.
- MEB (2018). Ortaokul (5-8. Sınıflar) beden eğitimi ve spor dersi öğretim programı. Ankara.
- Önal, H.İ. ve Topçu, Ö.Ş. (2013). Eğitimi gerçekleştirmek: Öğretim programlarında okul kütüphanelerinin yeri. *Bilgi Dünyası*, 14(2), 306-328.
- Özçelik, D.A. (1992). Eğitim programları ve öğretim. Ankara: ÖSYM Yayınları.
- Özdemir, S.M. (2007). *Öğretim ilke ve yöntemleri*. (Edt: Ocak, G.), Ankara: PEGEM-A Yayıncılık.
- Senemoğlu, N. (2010). *Gelişim, öğrenme ve öğretim*. Ankara: PEGEM Akademi.
- Simpson, E.J. (1966). The classification of educational objectives: Psychomotor domain. *Illinois Journal of Home Economics*, 10(4), 110-144.
- Sönmez, V. (2007). *Program geliştirmede öğretmen el kitabı*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Sönmez, V. (2011). *Öğretim ilke ve yöntemleri*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Tahaoğlu, A. (2014). Ortaöğretim Türk edebiyatı dersi öğretim programı kazanımlarının bilişsel açıdan incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara
- Uğraş, S. ve Aral, H. (2018). Ortaokul beden eğitimi ders programındaki kazanımların yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre değerlendirilmesi. *Journal of Global Sport and Education Research*, 1(1), 33-46.
- Ünsal, S. ve Korkmaz, F. (2017). Felsefe dersi öğretim programındaki kazanımların farklı taksonomiler bağlamında incelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(2), 948-967.
- Varış, F. (1988). *Eğitimde program geliştirme: Teori ve teknikler* (4.Baskı). Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yolcu, H.H. (2019). İlkokul öğretim programı 3 ve 4. sınıf fen bilimleri dersi kazanımlarının revize edilmiş Bloom taksonomisi açısından analizi ve değerlendirilmesi. *İlköğretim Online*, 18(1), 253-262.
- Yüksel, S. (2007). Bilişsel alanın sınıflamasında (Taksonomi) yeni gelişmeler ve sınıflamalar. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(3), 479-509.
- Zorluoğlu, S.L., Kızılaslan, A. ve Sözbilir, M. (2016). Ortaöğretim kimya dersi öğretim programı kazanımlarının yapılandırılmış Bloom taksonomisine göre analizi ve değerlendirilmesi. *Necatibey Eğitim Fakültesi Elektronik Fen ve Matematik Eğitimi Dergisi*, 10(1), 260-279.
- Zorluoğlu, S.L., Şahintürk, A. ve Bağrıyanık, K.E. (2013). 2013 yılı fen bilimleri öğretim programı kazanımlarının yenilenmiş Bloom taksonomisine göre analizi ve değerlendirilmesi. *Bartın Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 6(1), 1-15.